Non-Markovianity hierarchy of Gaussian processes and quantum amplification

Pietro Liuzzo-Scorpo,[1] Wojciech Roga,[2] Leonardo A. M. Souza,[3,1] Nadja K. Bernardes,[4] and Gerardo Adesso[1]

[1]*Centre for the Mathematics and Theoretical Physics of Quantum Non-Equilibrium Systems, School of Mathematical Sciences, The University of Nottingham, University Park, Nottingham NG7 2RD, United Kingdom*
[2]*Department of Physics, University of Strathclyde, John Anderson Building, 107 Rottenrow, Glasgow G4 0NG, United Kingdom*
[3]*Universidade Federal de Viçosa – Campus Florestal, LMG818 Km6, Minas Gerais, Florestal 35690-000, Brazil*
[4]*Departamento de Física, Universidade Federal de Minas Gerais, Belo Horizonte, Caixa Postal 702, 30161-970, Brazil*

(Dated: October 28, 2016)

We investigate dynamics of Gaussian states of continuous variable systems under Gaussianity preserving channels. We introduce a hierarchy of such evolutions encompassing Markovian, weakly and strongly non-Markovian processes, and provide simple criteria to distinguish between the classes, based on the degree of positivity of intermediate Gaussian maps. We classify all single-mode phase-insensitive Gaussian channels according to their non-Markovianity degree, and show that weak non-Markovianity has an operational significance as it leads to temporary amplification of Gaussian inputs beyond the fundamental quantum limit. Explicit examples and applications are discussed.

arXiv:1610.07893v2 [quant-ph] 27 Oct 2016

Introduction. Non-Markovian evolutions of open quantum systems have been extensively studied in recent years [1–3]. During these evolutions, memory effects appear in many forms. Efforts are devoted to detect, classify and characterise them by witnesses and measures that capture different manifestations [1, 2, 4–16]. These studies are motivated by the search for better control of quantum states. In quantum computation, memory effects make an impact e.g. on error correction schemes or reduction of decoherence rates [17–22]. Not less important is the impact on cryptography [23], where one usually assume that an eavesdropper has full access to the environment and can manipulate it thwarting security. Moreover, Markovian evolutions may not fully describe certain processes at the intersection between quantum physics and biology, whose efficiency can be enhanced by memory effects [24–26]. Finally, experimental techniques are now mature to investigate open quantum systems beyond the Markovian regime [27–37].

Markovianity of a quantum evolution with continuous or discrete time is intrinsically related to the possibility of dividing the quantum map describing the process in completely positive (CP) intermediate maps, i.e., CP-divisibility [15, 38, 39]. A quantum process defined by a family of CP maps $\{\Lambda_t\}$ is said to be Markovian if it is CP-divisible, i.e. such that an intermediate map $\tilde{\Lambda}_{t+\tau,t}$, defined by

$$\Lambda_{t+\tau} = \tilde{\Lambda}_{t+\tau,t}\Lambda_t \,, \tag{1}$$

is a CP map for all times $t, \tau > 0$. Indeed, a CP map can always be represented by an interaction of the evolving system with an uncorrelated environment [40]. The lack of correlations at each step denotes the lack of memory, hence Markovianity. On the other hand, we recognise a non-Markovian process when the proper description of an evolution cannot be found among CP-divisible maps. In this case, correlations between system and environment are essential at some stage.

The association of Markovian processes with CP-divisible maps results in important restrictions. For instance, entanglement, mutual information, or quantum channel capacity cannot increase if a CP map is applied locally to the subsystems. Similarly, measures of distinguishability between quantum states, like fidelity or trace distance, are contractive under CP maps. A violation of CP-divisibility can then be witnessed by the temporary increase of the above quantities [5–13].

Proper measures of non-Markovianity are based on direct examination of complete positivity of all intermediate maps in a process [6, 14–16]. A unified picture of several measures of non-Markovianity has been presented in [15], where a hierarchy of the degrees of non-Markovianity was introduced, based on the smallest degree of positivity of intermediate maps.

Further important insight into non-Markovian processes and their relation to CP maps is achieved considering evolutions of quantum systems living in infinite-dimensional Hilbert spaces, such as states of light studied in quantum optics. These states are described by continuous variables (CV) related to the quadratures (position and momentum operators) [41]. In the CV formalism, positivity of density matrices and complete positivity of maps acquire intuitive physical meanings. The first is equivalent to fulfilment of the uncertainty principle by the system, or equivalently the canonical commutation relations between the quadratures. The CP condition for a map ensures in turn that the uncertainty relation is not violated for any legitimate input state. Of course, the monotonicity of distinguishability, entanglement, and other informational quantities when the evolving subsystems are driven by CP-divisible processes extends to CV systems as well.

In this paper we consider evolutions of Gaussian quantum systems governed by Gaussianity preserving processes (Gaussian maps). Taking inspiration from the line drawn in [15], where a non-Markovianity degree for finite-dimensional quantum processes has been introduced, and building on the methods of [14], where an elegant characterization of non-Markovianity has been accomplished for Gaussian maps in terms of the violation of CP-divisibility, we identify a simple hierarchy based on the degree of divisibility of Gaussian maps acting on Gaussian states, which will allow us to distinguish three classes of processes: Markovian, weakly and strongly non-Markovian. This hierarchy is obtained by introducing an intermediate notion of k-positivity for Gaussian maps and providing necessary and sufficient criteria to test for it.

After having established this hierarchy for general Gaussianity preserving processes, we focus on the relevant class of single-mode phase-insensitive channels. We classify the Gaussian non-Markovianity degree of these channels in an intuitive two-dimensional diagram, divided in three regions corresponding to the three classes of the hierarchy. We then relate the latter to possibilities and limitations for quantum amplification. In particular, weakly non-Markovian phase-insensitive channels allow, during some intermediate time, for amplification of Gaussian inputs with less added noise than the fundamental quantum limit [42–45]. This provides an interesting operational interpretation for weak non-Markovianity, which

had not been noticed in the finite-dimensional case [15]. Potential applications to quantum cryptography are discussed.

Gaussian states and Gaussian maps. In the set of quantum states of CV systems, for instance the states of light, we distinguish n-mode Gaussian states ρ as those represented by a Gaussian characteristic function in phase space [41, 46, 47]. These states are fully characterized by the first and second statistical moments of their quadrature vector $\hat{O} = \{\hat{q}_1, \hat{p}_1, \ldots, \hat{q}_n, \hat{p}_n\}$, where $\hat{q}_j$ and $\hat{p}_k$ are canonical conjugate coordinates satisfying the commutation relation (assuming natural units, $\hbar = 1$) $[\hat{q}_j, \hat{p}_k] = \frac{i}{2}\delta_{jk}$. The first moment vector $D = \langle \hat{O} \rangle$ is also called the displacement vector, while the matrix containing the second statistical moments $(\sigma_n)_{jk} = \frac{1}{2}\langle \{\hat{O}_j, \hat{O}_k\}_+ \rangle$ is the covariance matrix σ_n. A *bona fide* condition that must be satisfied by all physical n-mode states is the Robertson-Schrödinger uncertainty relation $\sigma_n \geq \frac{i}{2}\Omega_n$, where $\Omega_n = \left(\begin{smallmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ -1 & 0 \end{smallmatrix}\right)^{\oplus n}$ is the n-mode symplectic matrix [48].

Quantum channels that preserve Gaussianity of their inputs are known as Gaussian maps. A Gaussian map acting on n-mode Gaussian states is represented by a pair of matrices (X, Y), where X and Y are $2n \times 2n$ matrices and Y is symmetric, acting on a covariance matrix σ_n and the first moments' vector D as follows [14, 49–53]

$$\sigma_n \quad \rightarrow \quad \sigma_n' = X\sigma_n X^T + Y \,, \tag{2}$$

$$D \quad \rightarrow \quad D' = XD. \tag{3}$$

A Gaussian map described by the pair (X, Y) is CP if and only if the following well-known inequality is fulfilled [14, 52–54]

$$Y - \tfrac{i}{2}\Omega_n + \tfrac{i}{2}X\Omega_n X^T \geq 0 \,. \tag{4}$$

This inequality can be obtained from the Stinespring dilation theorem [40], i.e. considering the Gaussian map as the result of a Gaussian unitary evolution acting on principal system and environment, initialised in an uncorrelated $(n+m)$-mode Gaussian state, followed by a partial trace over the m environmental modes, $\sigma_n \rightarrow \sigma_n' = \mathrm{Tr}_E\left[S(\sigma_n \oplus \sigma_m^E)S^T\right]$; here one uses the fact that a Gaussian unitary is represented by a symplectic transformation $S \in \mathrm{Sp}(2(n+m), \mathbb{R})$ (i.e., one that preserves the symplectic matrix Ω) acting by congruence on covariance matrices, see e.g. [41].

k-positivity of Gaussian maps. We now introduce a notion of k-positivity for Gaussian maps with Gaussian inputs, inspired by the hierarchy of k-positivity for finite-dimensional quantum channels which emerges from Choi's theorem [55]. We define a Gaussian map acting on n-mode Gaussian states as k-positive (kP) if its extension on k additional modes is positive, i.e., if for all $(n+k)$-mode input Gaussian states described by covariance matrices $\sigma_{n+k} \geq i\Omega_{n+k}$ it holds

$$(X \oplus \mathbb{1}_k)\sigma_{n+k}(X \oplus \mathbb{1}_k)^T + Y \oplus \mathbb{0}_k \geq \tfrac{i}{2}\Omega_{n+k} \,. \tag{5}$$

Quite interestingly, we prove in the Appendix that a Gaussian map with Gaussian inputs is CP if and only if it is kP with any $k \geq 1$. More precisely, we establish the following result.

Theorem 1. *For any n, the CP condition (4) is equivalent to the kP condition (5) with $k = 1$.*

This means that, in the Gaussian scenario (unlike the general finite-dimensional case [61]), one has a very simple hierarchy of k-positivity. Based on Theorem 1, we can in fact distinguish only three classes of Gaussian maps acting on Gaussian initial states: completely positive (CP, $k = 1$), positive (P, $k = 0$) and not positive (NP). We can derive a simple (and, to the best of our knowledge, original) condition to distinguish between the latter two classes, in terms of the pair (X, Y). Noticing that for (5) to hold it is sufficient to check its validity on pure Gaussian states, whose covariance matrix can be written in general as $\boldsymbol{\sigma} = \frac{1}{2}SS^T$ with S a symplectic transformation, we find that a Gaussian map with Gaussian inputs is positive ($k = 0$) if and only if

$$\tfrac{1}{2}XSS^TX^T + Y - \tfrac{i}{2}\Omega_n \geq 0 \,, \quad \forall\, S \in \mathrm{Sp}(2n, \mathbb{R}) \,. \tag{6}$$

Conditions (4) and (6) allow one to fully classify the positivity properties of any $n \rightarrow n$-mode Gaussian maps described by the pair (X, Y) acting on Gaussian inputs. The conditions can be easily generalised to $n \rightarrow m$-mode Gaussian maps.

Hierarchy of Gaussian non-Markovianity. Gaussian processes which are continuous in time are represented by a pair of time-dependent matrices (X_t, Y_t) acting on the covariance matrix and the displacement vector as in (2) and (3) respectively. Since we are interested in the divisibility properties of these maps, we can follow the approach of [14] and study the positivity of the intermediate map $(X_\tau(t), Y_\tau(t))$ acting on the evolving system between times t and $t + \tau$ and affecting the covariance matrix as usual, $\sigma(t) \rightarrow \sigma(t+\tau) = X_\tau(t)\sigma(t)X_\tau^T(t) + Y_\tau(t)$, with [14]

$$X_\tau(t) = X_{t+\tau}X_t^{-1} \,, \quad Y_\tau(t) = Y_{t+\tau} - X_\tau(t)Y_tX_\tau^T(t) \,. \tag{7}$$

Our aim is now to exploit the above classification to provide a complete hierarchy of (non-)Markovianity of Gaussian maps, inspired by the study of non-Markovianity degree in finite-dimensional channels [15]. First of all, we recall that imposing the condition for complete positivity on the intermediate map for all $t, \tau > 0$, one obtains the condition for a Markovian evolution as given in [14],

$$\tfrac{i}{2}X_\tau(t)\Omega X_\tau^T(t) + Y_\tau(t) - \tfrac{i}{2}\Omega \geq 0 \,. \tag{8}$$

Any Gaussian map not complying with condition (8) at some intermediate times is non-Markovian [14]. We can now add an extra layer to such a dichotomic characterization. Namely, if not all intermediate maps are CP, i.e. if for some times condition (8) is violated, but the positivity condition

$$\tfrac{1}{2}X_\tau(t)SS^TX_\tau^T(t) + Y_\tau(t) - \tfrac{i}{2}\Omega \geq 0 \tag{9}$$

holds for every $S \in \mathrm{Sp}(2n, \mathbb{R})$ for all the maps, then the evolution is said to be *weakly* non-Markovian. Finally, if there is at least one intermediate map violating condition (9), the process is called *strongly* non-Markovian.

It is worth noticing that, in order to check the CP- (respectively P-) divisibility of the map (X_t, Y_t), it is sufficient to verify that the inequality (8) [resp. (9)] holds in the limit of small τ. This is due to the fact that the composition of an arbitrary number N of intermediate CP (P) maps is CP (P).

Complete classification of one-mode Gaussian maps. In what follows, for ease of illustration, we restrict ourselves to one-mode quantum Gaussian processes. From the total one-mode Gaussian map (X_t, Y_t), we can construct, thanks to (7), the intermediate maps given by the pair of 2×2 matrices $(X_\tau(t), Y_\tau(t))$. In the limit of small τ, $X_\tau(t)$ and $Y_\tau(t)$ are close to the identity and to the null matrix respectively. Expanding these matrices up to the first order in τ we get

$$X_\tau(t) \;=\; (1 + \epsilon_t\tau)\;\mathbb{1} + \tau\,\mathcal{X}(t) + o(\tau^2) \,, \tag{10}$$

$$Y_\tau(t) \;=\; \tau\,\mathcal{Y}(t) + o(\tau^2) \,, \tag{11}$$

where $\mathcal{X}(t)$ and $\mathcal{Y}(t)$ are in general arbitrary real matrices with the only constraint of $\mathcal{Y}(t)$ being symmetric.

The following two Theorems (proofs given in the Appendix) then completely characterise the degree of Gaussian (non-)Markovianity of any one-mode Gaussian map given by (X_t, Y_t), in terms of the three real parameters

$$\epsilon_t \equiv \tfrac{d}{dt} \ln\left(\sqrt{|\det X_t|}\right) , \tag{12}$$

$$\delta_t \equiv (\det X_t)^2 \det\left(\tfrac{d}{dt}\left(X_t^{-1} Y_t X_t^{-T}\right)\right) , \tag{13}$$

$$\kappa_t \equiv \tfrac{d}{dt}\mathrm{tr}\, Y_t - 2\,\mathrm{tr}\left(Y_t \tfrac{d}{dt} \ln |X_t|\right) . \tag{14}$$

Theorem 2. *A one-mode Gaussian process given by (X_t, Y_t) is CP-divisible if for all $t > 0$,*

$$\delta_t \geq \epsilon_t^2 \quad \textit{and} \quad \kappa_t \geq 0 . \tag{15}$$

Theorem 3. *A one-mode Gaussian process given by (X_t, Y_t) is divisible into positive intermediate maps (P-divisible) if for all $t > 0$*

$$\delta_t \geq \tfrac{1}{4}(|\epsilon_t| - \epsilon_t)^2 \quad \textit{and} \quad \kappa_t \geq 0 . \tag{16}$$

The Gaussian processes for which Theorem 2 is satisfied are Markovian. Those for which Theorem 3 is satisfied while Theorem 2 is not are weakly non-Markovian. Those for which Theorem 3 is not satisfied are strongly non-Markovian.

Let us now define

$$\mu_t \equiv \begin{cases} \mathrm{sgn}(\kappa_t)\sqrt{\delta_t} , & \text{for } \delta_t \geq 0 \\ -\sqrt{|\delta_t|} , & \text{for } \delta_t < 0 \end{cases} . \tag{17}$$

Due to Theorems 2 and 3, for a one-mode Gaussian process we can then distinguish three regions in the space of parameters μ and ϵ as shown in Fig. 1, which correspond to the intermediate map being respectively CP, P, and NP:

$$\begin{aligned} \Upsilon_{CP} &\equiv \{(\epsilon,\mu) \,|\, \mu \geq |\epsilon|\}, \\ \Upsilon_{P} &\equiv \{(\epsilon,\mu) \,|\, 2\mu \geq |\epsilon| - \epsilon\}, \\ \Upsilon_{NP} &\equiv \mathbb{R}^2/\Upsilon_P. \end{aligned} \tag{18}$$

A similar diagram and classification can be found e.g. in [54, 56, 57]. However, the parameters there characterise the legitimate global quantum channels, therefore regions analogous to $\Upsilon_{P/CP} \equiv \Upsilon_P/\Upsilon_{CP}$ and Υ_{NP} are denoted as non-physical. In our case, since the diagram is built for intermediate maps of a globally CP process, which by themselves do not need to be CP, these regions are permitted. On the other hand, complete positivity of the global process describing the evolution from time $t = 0$ to any other later time t gives us important restrictions on the intermediate maps.

Let us first establish a relation between the degree of Gaussian (non-)Markovianity and the intermediate maps represented by points on the diagram. Processes that are continuous in time, described by time-dependent parameters (ϵ_s, μ_s), define paths on the diagram. We can then characterise the non-Markovianity of the evolution studying the paths $\Gamma_t \equiv \{(\epsilon_s, \mu_s)\}_{s=0}^{t}$ on the (ϵ, μ) plane. If an evolution is Markovian then the trajectory will be confined at all times in the Υ_{CP} region, $\Gamma_t \in \Upsilon_{CP} \quad \forall\, t > 0$. If at some times the trajectory trespasses in the $\Upsilon_{P/CP}$ region but never trespasses in the Υ_{NP} one, i.e. if $\Gamma_t \in \Upsilon_P \quad \forall\, t > 0$ and $\exists\, s : (\epsilon_s, \mu_s) \notin \Upsilon_{CP}$, then the evolution is weakly non-Markovian. If at some times the trajectory crosses into the Υ_{NP} region, i.e. $\exists\, s : (\epsilon_s, \mu_s) \notin \Upsilon_P$, then the evolution is strongly non-Markovian.



FIG. 1: Diagram of parameters (ϵ, μ) characterising one-mode Gaussian intermediate maps. The diagonal striped pattern corresponds to the P- but not CP-divisible region $\Upsilon_{P/CP}$. The crosshatch pattern identifies the CP-divisible region Υ_{CP}. The white region corresponds to Υ_{NP}. A path on the diagram denotes a process with parameters changed continuously in time. The solid black path represents a quantum Brownian motion process at zero temperature as described in the text, with $\omega_0/\omega_c = 2$.

Examples: Phase-insensitive maps. We now analyse in more detail the physical constraints imposed on processes described by a family of CP maps $\{(X_t, Y_t)\}$, each transforming states from an initial $t = 0$ to a later time t. The families of maps establish paths on the diagram introduced in Fig. 1. In particular, we will now drop $\mathcal{X}$ from (10) and consider only the phase-insensitive part of X_τ; furthermore, we will assume that $\mathcal{Y}$ is proportional to the identity. These restrictions are justified by the fact that they hold for the most physically relevant dynamical processes such as the quantum Brownian motion and the bosonic amplitude damping channel [12, 14, 23, 35, 38, 58–60]. Let us then consider intermediate maps of the following form, $X_\tau(t) = (1 + \epsilon_t \tau)\ \mathbb{1}$, $Y_\tau(t) = \mu_t\, \tau\, \mathbb{1}$, with $\mu_t \equiv \mathrm{sgn}(\kappa_t)\sqrt{\delta_t}$.

Applying the composition law for Gaussian maps it is easy to show that the map from time $t = 0$ to time $t = N\tau$, such that $\lim_{N\to\infty} \lim_{\tau\to 0} N\tau = t > 0$, is:

$$X_t = e^{\int_0^t \epsilon_s ds}\, \mathbb{1}, \quad Y_t = \left(e^{2\int_0^t \epsilon_s ds} \int_0^t \mu_r e^{-2\int_0^r \epsilon_s ds} dr\right)\mathbb{1} . \tag{19}$$

A paradigmatic example, widely studied in the literature (see e.g. [38, 58] and references therein), is the quantum Brownian motion model. With a secular and weak-coupling approximation, the master equation is given by $\dot{\rho}_t = \frac{\Delta_t+\gamma_t}{2}[2\hat{a}\rho_t\hat{a}^\dagger - \{\hat{a}^\dagger\hat{a}, \rho_t\}_+] + \frac{\Delta_t-\gamma_t}{2}[2\hat{a}^\dagger\rho_t\hat{a} - \{\hat{a}\hat{a}^\dagger, \rho_t\}_+]$, where $\hat{a}, \hat{a}^\dagger$ are the ladder operators satisfying $[\hat{a}, \hat{a}^\dagger] = 1$, while Δ_t and γ_t are the diffusion and damping coefficients, respectively, whose specific expressions can be found once the form of the spectral density of the bath is given. The evolved covariance matrix of a single-mode Gaussian state undergoing this dynamics is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma(t) &= \left(e^{-\int_0^t \gamma_s ds}\mathbb{1}\right)\sigma(0)\left(e^{-\int_0^t \gamma_s ds}\mathbb{1}\right) \\ &+ e^{-2\int_0^t \gamma_s ds} \int_0^t e^{2\int_0^s \gamma_r dr} \Delta_s ds\, \mathbb{1} , \end{aligned} \tag{20}$$

which corresponds to the map (X_t, Y_t) given by (19) with the substitutions $\epsilon_t \to -\gamma_t$ and $\mu_t \to \Delta_t$. A trajectory on the (ϵ, μ) plane, for a system with characteristic frequency ω_0 and an Ohmic spectral density $J(\omega) = \omega e^{-\omega/\omega_c}$ with an exponential cut-off frequency ω_c, at zero temperature, is reported as a dashed path in Fig. 1.

In order to have a physical evolution from a composition of infinitesimal phase-insensitive maps, we have to impose the

CP condition (4) on the global map described by (X_t, Y_t) as given in (19). The eigenvalues of the lhs of (4) are in this case

$$\Lambda_{\pm} = \pm\tfrac{1}{2} + e^{2\int_0^t \epsilon_s ds}\left(\mp\tfrac{1}{2} + \int_0^t e^{-2\int_0^r \epsilon_s ds}\mu_r dr\right).$$

The conditions $\Lambda_{\pm} \geq 0$ can be rewritten as (see Appendix)

$$\int_0^t e^{-2\int_0^s \epsilon_s ds}\,(\mu_r \pm \epsilon_r)\,dr \geq 0 \quad \forall\, t > 0\,. \tag{21}$$

As expected, these conditions are weaker than the condition for CP-divisibility, allowing the trajectories in the diagram of Fig. 1 to go beyond the region Υ_{CP}. However, the following constraint on the physical paths can be derived. By expanding the lhs of inequalities (21) at first order in t we get $\mu_0 \geq |\epsilon_0|$, that is, the trajectory must begin in the CP region Υ_{CP}. Moreover, if the trajectory starts on the boundaries of region Υ_{CP}, i.e., $\mu_0 = |\epsilon_0|$, then $\dot{\mu}_0 \geq |\dot{\epsilon}_0|$. This tells us that not only the trajectory must start in the CP-divisibility region, but it has to have an initial "speed" such that for the immediate subsequent time it will remain inside Υ_{CP}. A path which starts in the origin, then moves along the boundary of the crosshatched region up to a time t_i and then trespasses in either region Υ_{NP} or $\Upsilon_{P/CP}$, is not allowed.

Operational significance of Gaussian non-Markovianity degrees. The significance of the last no-go rule is related to fundamental physical properties. Suppose indeed that at time $t = 0$ an initial state is described by a thermal covariance matrix $\sigma = \mathrm{diag}\{\nu, \nu\}$, with $\nu \geq \frac{1}{2}$. Under the action of the map (19) at time $\tilde{t} > 0$, the product of the canonical variances is

$$\langle\hat{q}^2\rangle\langle\hat{p}^2\rangle = e^{4\int_0^{\tilde{t}} \epsilon_s ds}\Big(\nu + \int_0^{\tilde{t}} \mu_r e^{-2\int_0^r \epsilon_s ds}\, dr\Big)^2\,. \tag{22}$$

If $\Lambda_- < 0$, we obtain $\langle\hat{q}^2\rangle\langle\hat{p}^2\rangle < e^{2\int_0^{\tilde{t}} \epsilon_s ds}\Big(e^{\int_0^{\tilde{t}} \epsilon_s ds}\nu - \sinh\big(\int_0^{\tilde{t}} \epsilon_s\, ds\big)\Big)^2$, which for a pure initial state (i.e. the vacuum or a Glauber coherent state, with $\nu = \frac{1}{2}$) reduces to

$$\langle\hat{q}^2\rangle\langle\hat{p}^2\rangle < \tfrac{1}{4}, \tag{23}$$

i.e. to a violation of the uncertainty principle, which is not physically admitted. Indeed, a trajectory lying along the border between Υ_{CP} and Υ_{NP} (representing, e.g., a damping master equation with generally time-dependent damping constant) preserves the purity of such a state. To better understand this, let us consider the limiting case of having a map such that $-\epsilon_t = \mu_t > 0$ for $0 < t < t_i$ and that $-\epsilon_t > \mu_t$ for $t_i < t < \tilde{t}$. Up to t_i the X_t part of the Gaussian map decreases both variances of the pure state while the noise added by the Y_t part of the channel compensates the loss and the state remains pure. Then, for $t > t_i$ the noise introduced by Y_t is not enough and we have a violation of the Heinsenberg uncertainty relation.

However, crossing the border during the evolution would be possible if the preceding dynamics shrank the state domain of the intermediate map such that its subsequent action, corresponding to a temporary dilation of this domain, would not violate the uncertainty relation. The non-Markovian effect, manifested in the dilation of the volume of the physical states accessible during the dynamics, can then be seen as a backflow of information from the environment into the system [9].

Let us now briefly comment on the other border of the CP region, between Υ_{CP} and $\Upsilon_{P/CP}$. For any dynamics with added noise ($\mu_t > 0$), a trajectory along this border is such that $\epsilon_t = \mu_t > 0$, which is responsible for an *amplification*, that is, the multiplication of the displacement vector by a factor greater than 1 and a corresponding increase of the variances. Along such a path, the noise added is the minimum allowed for quantum linear amplifiers [44]. The crossing of this border into the $\Upsilon_{P/CP}$ region at a time $t_i > 0$ is allowed only if the noise added up to that time is sufficient to permit a subsequent amplification beyond the quantum limit. This is possible thanks to the correlations established between system and environment during the preceding evolution. We can conclude therefore that a Gaussian phase-insensitive process (with added noise) is weakly non-Markovian if at any moment in time one observes that, although the covariances increase, a Gaussian state evolving under such a process is amplified beating the quantum limit. This provides an operational interpretation for the elusive phenomenon of weak non-Markovianity [15] in the context of quantum amplification.

Conclusions. The main goal of this paper was to introduce a meaningful hierarchy of non-Markovianity for CV Gaussian processes and establish its physical significance. We provided a necessary and sufficient criterion to check for the positivity of a Gaussian map with Gaussian inputs. We then distinguished three main types of evolutions: Markovian processes, weakly and strongly non-Markovian ones. We then discussed the relationship between this hierarchy and the physical limits of quantum amplification.

In the single-mode case, we gave a simple prescription to distinguish to which class a certain Gaussianity preserving process belongs based on the representation of the map as a path (ϵ_t, μ_t) on a 2-dimensional plane, where ϵ_t and μ_t can be computed explicitly from the pair of matrices (X_t, Y_t) describing the action of the map. We also studied, in the paradigmatic case of phase-insensitive channels, the constraints on these paths due to the requirement of having a global CP map. This allowed us to give a physical interpretation of weak- and strong- non-Markovian processes in terms of amplification beyond the quantum limit and of information backflow from the environment into the system, respectively. These findings can be of importance for quantum cryptography. For instance, an eavesdropper with access to knowledge whether a given communication channel is weakly or strongly non-Markovian can amplify a state in such a way that the legitimate parties may find it too noisy or too weak to be useful, discarding it. Moreover, if the legitimate parties do not fully control the way the shared state is prepared, unexpected behaviour can be observed if possible non-Markovian effects are ignored.

It is also worth noting that all the physical processes we studied as particular instances, such as quantum Brownian motion and damping model, display either Markovianity or strong non-Markovianity, while we could not find a typical master equation revealing purely weak non-Markovianity. This may be explained by the fact that the processes we considered all admit a final state at thermal equilibrium with the environment. We expect that some purely weak non-Markovian processes could be retrieved if an evolution of a quantum system in an active environment that pumps energy into the system is analysed. Investigating the memory effects in such processes could be an extension of this work.

Acknowledgments

We thank Sabrina Maniscalco, Dariusz Chruściński, John Jeffers, Marco Piani, Gianpaolo Torre, and Fabrizio Illumi-

nati for discussions. This work was supported by the European Research Council (ERC) Starting Grant GQCOP (Grant No. 637352), the Foundational Questions Institute (fqxi.org) Physics of the Observer Programme (Grant No. FQXi-RFP-1601), the Brazilian Agencies CAPES (Grant No. 6842/2014-03) and CNPq (Grant No. 470131/2013-6), the UK EPSRC Quantum Imaging Hub (Grant No. EP/M01326X/1), and the University of Nottingham (Graduate School Travel Prize 2015).

[1] Á. Rivas, S. F. Huelga, and M. B. Plenio, Rep. Prog. Phys. **77**, 094001 (2014).
[2] H.-P. Breuer, E.-M. Laine, J. Piilo, and B. Vacchini, Rev. Mod. Phys. **88**, 021002 (2016).
[3] I. de Vega and D. Alonso, arXiv:1511.06994 (Rev. Mod. Phys. in press) (2015).
[4] M. M. Wolf, J. Eisert, T. S. Cubitt, and J. I. Cirac, Phys. Rev. Lett. **101**, 150402 (2008).
[5] H.-P. Breuer, E.-M. Laine, and J. Piilo, Phys. Rev. Lett. **103**, 210401 (2009).
[6] Á. Rivas, S. F. Huelga, and M. B. Plenio, Phys. Rev. Lett. **105**, 050403 (2010).
[7] X.-M. Lu, X. Wang, and C. P. Sun, Phys. Rev. A **82**, 042103 (2010).
[8] E.-M. Laine, J. Piilo, and H.-P. Breuer, Phys. Rev. A **81**, 062115 (2010).
[9] S. Lorenzo, F. Plastina, and M. Paternostro, Phys. Rev. A **88**, 020102 (2013).
[10] B. Bylicka, D. Chruściński, and S. Maniscalco, Sci. Rep. **4** (2014).
[11] H. S. Dhar, M. N. Bera, and G. Adesso, Phys. Rev. A **91**, 032115 (2015).
[12] L. A. M. Souza, H. S. Dhar, M. N. Bera, P. Liuzzo-Scorpo, and G. Adesso, Phys. Rev. A **92**, 052122 (2015).
[13] F. Buscemi and N. Datta, Phys. Rev. A **93**, 012101 (2016).
[14] G. Torre, W. Roga, and F. Illuminati, Phys. Rev. Lett. **115**, 070401 (2015).
[15] D. Chruścinski and S. Maniscalco, Phys. Rev. Lett. **112**, 120404 (2014).
[16] F. A. Pollock, C. Rodrguez-Rosario, T. Frauenheim, M. Paternostro, and K. Modi, arXiv:1512.00589 (2015).
[17] E.-M. Laine, H.-P. Breuer, and J. Piilo, Sci. Rep. **4** (2014).
[18] G. He, J. Zhang, J. Zhu, and G. Zeng, Phys. Rev. A **84**, 034305 (2011).
[19] M. J. Biercuk, H. Uys, A. P. VanDevender, N. Shiga, W. M. Itano, and J. J. Bollinger, Nature **458**, 996 (2009).
[20] C. J. Myatt, B. E. King, Q. A. Turchette, C. A. Sackett, D. Kielpinski, W. M. Itano, C. Monroe, and D. J. Wineland, Nature (London) **403**, 269 (2000).
[21] F. Verstraete, M. M. Wolf, and J. I. Cirac, Nature Phys. **5**, 633 (2009).
[22] S. Haseli, G. Karpat, S. Salimi, A. S. Khorashad, F. F. Fanchini, B. Çakmak, G. H. Aguilar, S. P. Walborn, and P. H. S. Ribeiro, Phys. Rev. A **90**, 052118 (2014).
[23] R. Vasile, S. Maniscalco, M. G. A. Paris, H.-P. Breuer, and J. Piilo, Phys. Rev. A **84**, 052118 (2011).
[24] M. Thorwart, J. Eckel, J. Reina, P. Nalbach, and S. Weiss, Chem. Phys. Lett. **478**, 234 (2009).
[25] A. W. Chin, J. Prior, R. Rosenbach, F. Caycedo-Soler, S. F. Huelga, and M. B. Plenio, Nature Phys. **9**, 113 (2013).
[26] S. Huelga and M. Plenio, Contemp. Phys. **54**, 181 (2013).
[27] B.-H. Liu, L. Li, Y.-F. Huang, C.-F. Li, G.-C. Guo, E.-M. Laine, H.-P. Breuer, and J. Piilo, Nat Phys **7**, 931 (2011).
[28] A. Chiuri, C. Greganti, L. Mazzola, M. Paternostro, and P. Mataloni, Sci. Rep. **2**, 968 (2012).
[29] J.-S. Tang, C.-F. Li, Y.-L. Li, X.-B. Zou, G.-C. Guo, H.-P. Breuer, E.-M. Laine, and J. Piilo, EPL (Europhysics Letters) **97**, 10002 (2012).
[30] J.-S. Xu, K. Sun, C.-F. Li, X.-Y. Xu, G.-C. Guo, E. Andersson, R. Lo Franco, and G. Compagno, Nature Communications **4**, 2851 (2013).
[31] B.-H. Liu, D.-Y. Cao, Y.-F. Huang, C.-F. Li, G.-C. Guo, E.-M. Laine, H.-P. Breuer, and J. Piilo, Sci. Rep. **3**, 1781 (2013).
[32] F. F. Fanchini, G. Karpat, B. Çakmak, L. K. Castelano, G. H. Aguilar, O. J. Farías, S. P. Walborn, P. H. S. Ribeiro, and M. C. de Oliveira, Phys. Rev. Lett. **112**, 210402 (2014).
[33] A. Orieux, A. D'Arrigo, G. Ferranti, R. L. Franco, G. Benenti, E. Paladino, G. Falci, F. Sciarrino, and P. Mataloni, Sci. Rep. **5**, 8575 (2015).
[34] J. Jin, V. Giovannetti, R. Fazio, F. Sciarrino, P. Mataloni, A. Crespi, and R. Osellame, Phys. Rev. A **91**, 012122 (2015).
[35] S. Gröblacher, A. Trubarov, N. Prigge, G. D. Cole, M. Aspelmeyer, and J. Eisert, Nature Commun. **6**, 10.1038/ncomms8606.
[36] N. K. Bernardes, A. Cuevas, A. Orieux, C. H. Monken, P. Mataloni, F. Sciarrino, and M. F. Santos, Sci. Rep. **5**, 17520 (2015).
[37] N. K. Bernardes, J. P. S. Peterson, R. S. Sarthour, A. M. Souza, C. H. Monken, I. Roditi, I. S. Oliveira, and M. F. Santos, Sci. Rep. **6**, 33945 (2016).
[38] H. P. Breuer and F. Petruccione, *The Theory of Open Quantum Systems* (Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2002).
[39] R. Alicki and K. Lendi, Lecture Notes in Physics **717** (2007).
[40] W. F. Stinespring, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **6**, 211 (1955).
[41] G. Adesso, S. Ragy, and A. R. Lee, Open Syst. Inf. Dyn. **21**, 1440001 (2014).
[42] H. A. Haus and J. A. Mullen, Phys. Rev. **128**, 2407 (1962).
[43] C. M. Caves, Phys. Rev. D **26**, 1817 (1982).
[44] A. A. Clerk, M. H. Devoret, S. M. Girvin, F. Marquardt, and R. J. Schoelkopf, Rev. Mod. Phys. **82**, 1155 (2010).
[45] E. Eleftheriadou, S. M. Barnett, and J. Jeffers, Phys. Rev. Lett. **111**, 213601 (2013).
[46] G. Adesso and F. Illuminati, J. Phys. A: Math. Theor. **40**, 7821 (2007).
[47] A. Ferraro, S. Olivares, and M. G. A. Paris, *Gaussian states in continuous variable quantum information* (Napoli Series on Physics and Astrophysics (ed. Bibliopolis, Napoli, 2005), 2005).
[48] R. Simon, N. Mukunda, and B. Dutta, Phys. Rev. A **49**, 1567 (1994).
[49] J. Eisert, S. Scheel, and M. B. Plenio, Phys. Rev. Lett. **89**, 137903 (2002).
[50] J. Fiurášek, Phys. Rev. Lett. **89**, 137904 (2002).
[51] G. Giedke and J. I. Cirac, Phys. Rev. A **66**, 032316 (2002).
[52] G. Lindblad, J. Phys. A: Math. Gen. **33**, 5059 (2000).
[53] T. M. Heinosaari, A. S. Holevo, and M. M. Wolf, Quant. Inf. Comput. **10**, 619 (2010).
[54] G. De Palma, A. Mari, V. Giovannetti, and A. S. Holevo, J. Math. Phys. **56**, 052202 (2015).
[55] M.-D. Choi, Linear Algebra and its Applications **10**, 285 (1975).
[56] J. Schäfer, E. Karpov, R. García-Patrón, O. V. Pilyavets, and N. J. Cerf, Phys. Rev. Lett. **111**, 030503 (2013).
[57] V. Giovannetti, R. García-Patròn, N. J. Cerf, and A. S. Holevo, Nature Photon. **8**, 796 (2014).
[58] M. Schlosshauer, *Decoherence and the quantum-to-classical transition*, The Frontiers Collection No. 1 (Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg, 2007).
[59] G. Petrillo, G. Torre, and F. Illuminati, arXiv:1609.00917

(2016).
[60] G. Guarnieri, J. Nokkala, R. Schmidt, S. Maniscalco, and B. Vacchini, arXiv:1607.04977 (2016).
[61] A finite-dimensional channel acting on a d-dimensional system is d'-positive if its extension to the system plus a d'-dimensional ancilla is a positive map; then, said map is CP (i.e, ∞-positive) if and only if it is d-positive. Here, in the Gaussian scenario, we define instead k-positivity in terms of the extension to a number k of ancillary modes. Since a single mode is already infinite-dimensional, it is perhaps not surprising that complete positivity can be recovered already when $k = 1$ in our framework.

Supplemental Material

Appendix A1: Proof of Theorem 1

In order to prove Theorem 1 it is useful to prove the following Lemma first.

Lemma 4. *For any $2n \times 2n$ Hermitian matrix H the smallest eigenvalue of $\frac{1}{2}\, i\Omega_n + H$ is equal to the smallest eigenvalue of*

$$\tfrac{1}{2}\, i\Omega_{n-m} \oplus \mathbb{1}_m + QHQ^T, \tag{A1}$$

for some orthogonal symplectic matrix Q and for any $m < n$.

Proof. Let us denote $\lambda = \min\{\mathrm{eig}(H + \frac{1}{2}\, i\Omega_n)\}$ which corresponds to an eigenvector

$$v_\lambda = \begin{bmatrix} \alpha + i\beta \\ a_{n-1} + ib_{n-1} \\ a_n + ib_n \end{bmatrix}, \tag{A2}$$

where α and β are $2n-4$ dimensional real vectors and a_{n-1}, a_n, b_{n-1} and b_n are two dimensional real vectors. A transformation $Q \in \mathrm{Sp}(2n,\mathbb{R}) \cap \mathrm{SO}(2n)$ preserves the eigenvalues changing the corresponding eigenvector into $v'_\lambda = Qv_\lambda$. In order to prove the Lemma we start showing that there exists $Q_1 \in \mathrm{Sp}(2n,\mathbb{R}) \cap \mathrm{SO}(2n)$ such that $v^{(1)}_\lambda = Q_1 v_\lambda$ is an eigenvector for both $\frac{1}{2}\, i\Omega_n + Q_1 H Q_1^T$ and $\frac{1}{2}\, i\Omega_{n-1} \oplus \mathbb{1} + Q_1 H Q_1^T$ for the same eigenvalue λ. Denote

$$v^{(1)}_\lambda = \begin{bmatrix} \alpha^{(1)} + i\beta^{(1)} \\ a^{(1)}_{n-1} + ib^{(1)}_{n-1} \\ a^{(1)}_n + ib^{(1)}_n \end{bmatrix}. \tag{A3}$$

Observe the action of $\frac{1}{2}\, i\Omega_{n-1} \oplus \mathbb{1} + Q_1 H Q_1^T$ on $v^{(1)}_\lambda$

$$(Q_1 H Q_1^T + \tfrac{1}{2} i\Omega_n + \tfrac{1}{2}\mathbb{0}_{n-1} \oplus (\mathbb{1} - i\Omega)) \begin{bmatrix} \alpha^{(1)} + i\beta^{(1)} \\ a^{(1)}_{n-1} + ib^{(1)}_{n-1} \\ a^{(1)}_n + ib^{(1)}_n \end{bmatrix} = \lambda v^{(1)}_\lambda + \tfrac{1}{2} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbb{0} \\ 0 \\ a^{(1)}_n + \Omega b^{(1)}_n - i\Omega(a^{(1)}_n + \Omega b^{(1)}_n) \end{bmatrix}. \tag{A4}$$

Consider the following symplectic orthogonal transformation

$$Q_1 = \mathbb{1}_{n-2} \oplus \begin{bmatrix} \cos\phi_1 \mathbb{1} & -\sin\phi_1 R_1 \\ \sin\phi_1 R_1 & \cos\phi_1 \mathbb{1} \end{bmatrix}, \tag{A5}$$

where

$$R_1 = \begin{bmatrix} \cos\theta_1 & -\sin\theta_1 \\ \sin\theta_1 & \cos\theta_1 \end{bmatrix}. \tag{A6}$$

Using this transformation we have

$$v^{(1)}_\lambda = \begin{bmatrix} \alpha^{(1)} + i\beta^{(1)} \\ a^{(1)}_{n-1} + ib^{(1)}_{n-1} \\ a^{(1)}_n + ib^{(1)}_n \end{bmatrix} = Q_1 \begin{bmatrix} \alpha \\ a_{n-1} \\ a_n \end{bmatrix} + iQ_1 \begin{bmatrix} \beta \\ b_{n-1} \\ b_n \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \alpha \\ \cos\phi_1 a_{n-1} - \sin\phi_1 R_1 a_n \\ \cos\phi_1 a_n + \sin\phi_1 R_1 a_{n-1} \end{bmatrix} + i \begin{bmatrix} \beta \\ \cos\phi_1 b_{n-1} - \sin\phi_1 R_1 b_n \\ \cos\phi_1 b_n + \sin\phi_1 R_1 b_{n-1} \end{bmatrix}. \tag{A7}$$

The term $a^{(1)}_n + \Omega b^{(1)}_n$ from the last term of (A4) can now be written as

$$a^{(1)}_n + \Omega b^{(1)}_n = \cos\phi_1 (a_n + \Omega b_n) + \sin\phi_1 R_1 (a_{n-1} + \Omega b_{n-1}). \tag{A8}$$

Notice that for any two real two dimensional vectors r_1 and r_2 one can always find a rotation R_1 and an angle ϕ_1 such that $\cos\phi_1 r_1 + \sin\phi_1 R_1 r_2 = 0$. Indeed, the rotation R_1 directs the second vector to be parallel to the first and $\sin\phi_1$ and $\cos\phi_1$ adjust the lengths. Therefore, we showed that it is possible to find a symplectic orthogonal transformation Q_1, i.e. R_1 and ϕ_1, such that the last term of (A4) vanish, hence that $\mathbf{v}^{(1)}_\lambda$ is an eigenvector of $\frac{1}{2}\, i\Omega_{n-1} \oplus \mathbb{1} + Q_1 H Q_1^T$ corresponding to the eigenvalue λ.

Using an analogous argument we show that λ is also an eigenvalue of $\frac{1}{2}\, i\Omega_{n-2} \oplus \mathbb{1}_2 + Q_2 \tilde{H} Q_2^T$, where $\tilde{H} = Q_1 H Q_1^T$, corresponding to the eigenvector $v^{(2)}_\lambda = Q_2 v^{(1)}_\lambda$, with

$$Q_2 = \mathbb{1}_{n-3} \oplus \begin{bmatrix} \cos\phi_2 \mathbb{1} & -\sin\phi_2 R_2 \\ \sin\phi_2 R_2 & \cos\phi_2 \mathbb{1} \end{bmatrix} \oplus \mathbb{1}\ , \tag{A9}$$

and ϕ_2, R_2 satisfying

$$\cos\phi_2 (a^{(1)}_{n-1} + \Omega b^{(1)}_{n-1}) + \sin\phi_2 R_2 (a^{(1)}_{n-2} + \Omega b^{(1)}_{n-2}) = 0\ . \tag{A10}$$

Iterating this procedure we find that $Q = Q_k \cdot Q_{k-1} \ldots Q_2 \cdot Q_1$. This completes the proof of Lemma 4. □

Proof (of Theorem 1). We want now to deliver a condition on a map (X, Y) acting on an n-mode quantum system guaranteeing that the inequality (5) is satisfied for every σ_{n+k} where $1 \leq k$. We consider a generic bipartite $n+k$-modes covariance matrix

$$\sigma_{n+k} = \begin{pmatrix} A & C \\ C^T & B \end{pmatrix} \tag{A11}$$

where A is a $2n \times 2n$ symmetric matrix, B is a $2k \times 2k$ symmetric matrix and C is a $2n \times 2k$ matrix. Inequality (5) reads

$$\begin{pmatrix} XAX^T + Y - \frac{i}{2}\Omega_n & XC \\ C^T X^T & B - \frac{i}{2}\Omega_k \end{pmatrix} \geq 0 \Leftrightarrow \begin{pmatrix} A + X^{-1}(Y - \frac{i}{2}\Omega_n)(X^T)^{-1} & C \\ C^T & B - \frac{i}{2}\Omega_k \end{pmatrix} \geq 0, \tag{A12}$$

where we assume that X is invertible. As $\sigma_{n+k} \geq \frac{i}{2}\Omega_{n+k}$, we also have that $B - \frac{i}{2}\Omega_k \geq 0$. Assuming invertibility of $B - \frac{i}{2}\Omega_k$ the condition (A12) is equivalent to positivity of the Schur's complement of the block $B - \frac{i}{2}\Omega_k$, i.e.

$$A + X^{-1}(Y - \tfrac{i}{2}\Omega_n)(X^T)^{-1} - C(B - \tfrac{i}{2}\Omega_k)^{-1}C^T \geq 0. \tag{A13}$$

Moreover, applying the Schur's complement Lemma to $\sigma_{n+k} - \frac{i}{2}\Omega_{n+k}$ we get

$$A - \tfrac{i}{2}\Omega_n - C(B - \tfrac{i}{2}\Omega_k)^{-1}C^T \geq 0. \tag{A14}$$

Hence, the lhs of (A13) can be decomposed in a positive state-dependent term and in a map-dependent one:

$$\underbrace{A - \tfrac{i}{2}\Omega_n - C(B - \tfrac{i}{2}\Omega_k)^{-1}C^T}_{\text{state-dependent}} + \underbrace{X^{-1}(Y - \tfrac{i}{2}\Omega_n)(X^T)^{-1} + \tfrac{i}{2}\Omega_n}_{\text{map-dependent}} \geq 0\,. \tag{A15}$$

This condition has to be satisfied for any $n+k$-modes state. Due to the Williamson's theorem we can derive that for any mixed state σ_{mixed} there exists a pure state σ^S_{pure} such that

$$\sigma_{\text{mixed}} = S\ \text{diag}\{\nu_1, \nu_1, \ldots, \nu_{n+k}, \nu_{n+k}\}\ S^T \geq \tfrac{1}{2} S\ \mathbb{1}_{n+k}\ S^T = \sigma^S_{\text{pure}}\,. \tag{A16}$$

It is then sufficient to check that inequality (A15) holds for pure states to guarantee that it is satisfied for all states. By using again the Williamson's Theorem we find that local symplectic transformations S_n and S_k can bring the covariance matrix of any pure $n+k$-mode Gaussian state $(S_n \oplus S_k)\sigma^S_{\text{pure}}(S_n \oplus S_k)^T$ to the normal form i.e. the block form with non-zero entries only on the diagonal of each block. For $k \leq n$ the blocks are

$$A = \tfrac{1}{2} S_n \left(\bigoplus_{j=1}^{k} \cosh r_j \mathbb{1} \oplus \mathbb{1}_{n-k} \right) S_n^T\,, \tag{A17}$$

$$B = \tfrac{1}{2} S_k \left(\bigoplus_{j=1}^{k} \cosh r_j\ \mathbb{1} \right) S_k^T, \tag{A18}$$

$$C = \tfrac{1}{2} S_n \left(\frac{\bigoplus_{j=1}^{k} \sinh r_j\ \Lambda}{\diamond} \right) S_k^T\,, \tag{A19}$$

where $\diamond$ is an $2(n-k) \times 2n$ null matrix. We have then

$$C(B - \tfrac{i}{2}\Omega_k)^{-1}C^T\ =\ \tfrac{1}{2} S_n \left(\bigoplus_{j=1}^{k} \left(\cosh r_j \mathbb{1} - i\Omega \right) \oplus \mathbb{0}_{n-k} \right) S_n^T\,. \tag{A20}$$

In consequence, (A15) is satisfied for any state if

$$\tfrac{1}{2} S_n\,(i\Omega_k \oplus \mathbb{1}_{n-k})\,S_n^T + X^{-1}(Y - \tfrac{i}{2}\Omega_n)(X^T)^{-1} \geq 0 \tag{A21}$$

holds for every $S_n \in \text{Sp}(2n, \mathbb{R})$. Notice that for every S_n

$$\tfrac{1}{2} S_n (i\Omega_k \oplus \mathbb{1}_{n-k}) S_n^T + X^{-1}(Y - \tfrac{i}{2}\Omega_n)(X^T)^{-1} \geq \tfrac{i}{2}\Omega_n + X^{-1}(Y - \tfrac{i}{2}\Omega)(X^T)^{-1}. \tag{A22}$$

This inequality implies that the lhs cannot have an eigenvalue smaller than the smallest eigenvalue of the rhs. To complete the proof of Theorem 1 it is sufficient to show that there exists S_n such that the lhs and the rhs have the same the smallest eigenvalue for any $1 \leq k$. For $1 \leq k \leq n$, this is guaranteed by Lemma 4. Indeed, this lemma shows that there exists a symplectic orthogonal transformation Q such that

$$\min \left\{ \text{eig} \left(\tfrac{1}{2} Q^T (i\Omega_k \oplus \mathbb{1}_{n-k}) Q + X^{-1}(Y - \tfrac{i}{2}\Omega_n)(X^T)^{-1} \right) \right\} = \min \left\{ \text{eig} \left(\tfrac{i}{2}\Omega_n + X^{-1}(Y - \tfrac{i}{2}\Omega)(X^T)^{-1} \right) \right\}\,. \tag{A23}$$

If $k > n$, then (A15) becomes equal to the lhs of (A22). Summarising, the positivity condition (5) for $k = 1$ is equivalent to the positivity condition for any $k \geq 1$. This completes the proof of Theorem 1. □

Alternatively, the theorem can be justified by an extension of Choi's theorem on continuous variable systems, noting that a single mode is already an infinite dimensional system. A formal establishment of this argument can be easily derived.

Appendix A2: Proof of Theorem 2

Proof. Let us start with simplifying the CP condition (8): since $X_\tau(t)$ is a 2×2 matrix, we have that $X_\tau(t)\Omega X_\tau^T(t) = \Omega \det X_\tau(t)$. This allows us to reduce the CP-divisibility condition (8) to the following form

$$Y_\tau(t) + \frac{i}{2}(\det X_\tau(t) - 1)\Omega \geq 0\,, \tag{A1}$$

Moreover, noticing that

$$X_\tau(t) = \begin{pmatrix} (1+\tau\epsilon)+\tau\delta & \tau\phi \\ \tau\alpha & (1+\tau\epsilon)-\tau\delta \end{pmatrix} + o(\tau^2) \tag{A2}$$

we have

$$\begin{aligned} \det X_\tau(t) &= (1+\tau\epsilon)^2 - \tau^2(\delta^2 - \alpha\phi) + o(\tau^4) = \\ &= 1 + 2\tau\epsilon + o(\tau^2)\,, \end{aligned} \tag{A3}$$

and making use of (7), we find the expression for ϵ_t (12):

$$\begin{aligned} \epsilon_t &= \lim_{\tau\to 0}\frac{\det X_\tau(t) - 1}{2\tau} = \lim_{\tau\to 0}\frac{\det X_{t+\tau}X_t^{-1} - \det X_t X_t^{-1}}{2\tau} = \\ &= \lim_{\tau\to 0}\left(\frac{\det X_{t+\tau} - \det X_t}{2\tau}\right)\det X_t^{-1} = \frac{1}{2}\frac{d\det X_t}{dt}\frac{1}{\det X_t} = \\ &= \frac{d}{dt}\ln\left(\sqrt{|\det X_t|}\right) \end{aligned}$$

Now, since Y_τ is a 2×2 real symmetric matrix, it can be diagonalised by orthogonal transformations. Moreover, through a symplectic transformation of the form $Z_z \equiv \mathrm{diag}\{z, 1/z\}$ it can be brought to a diagonal form proportional to the identity or to the Pauli matrix σ_z. The proportionality factor is μ_t such that

$$\mu_t^2 = \mathrm{sgn}(\delta_t)\delta_t\,, \tag{A4}$$

where $\delta_t \equiv \det \mathcal{Y}(t)$. Making use of (7) one finds the expression for δ_t (13):

$$\begin{aligned} \det \mathcal{Y}(t) &= \lim_{\tau\to 0}\det\left(\frac{Y_\tau(t)}{\tau}\right) = \lim_{\tau\to 0}\det\left(\frac{Y_{t+\tau} - X_\tau(t)Y_tX_\tau^T(t)}{\tau}\right) = \\ &= \lim_{\tau\to 0}\det\left(\frac{Y_{t+\tau} - X_{t+\tau}X_t^{-1}Y_tX_t^{-T}X_{t+\tau}^T}{\tau}\right) = \\ &= \lim_{\tau\to 0}\det\left[\frac{X_{t+\tau}\left(X_{t+\tau}^{-1}Y_{t+\tau}X_{t+\tau}^{-T} - X_t^{-1}Y_tX_t^{-T}\right)X_{t+\tau}^T}{\tau}\right] \\ &= \lim_{\tau\to 0}\det\left(\frac{X_{t+\tau}^{-1}Y_{t+\tau}X_{t+\tau}^{-T} - X_t^{-1}Y_tX_t^{-T}}{\tau}\right)(\det X_{t+\tau})^2 = \\ &= (\det X_t)^2\det\left(\frac{d}{dt}\left(X_t^{-1}Y_tX_t^{-T}\right)\right) \end{aligned}$$

Let us consider the case $\delta_t \geq 0$, i.e. $\mathcal{Y}(t)$ is positive definite or negative definite, and let μ_t be the simplectic eigenvalue with the sign of $\mathcal{Y}(t)$, i.e. $\mu_t = \mathrm{sgn}(\kappa_t)\sqrt{\delta_t}$, where

$$\begin{aligned} \kappa_t &= \mathrm{tr}\,\mathcal{Y}(t) = \lim_{\tau\to 0}\frac{\mathrm{tr}\,Y_\tau(t)}{\tau} = \lim_{\tau\to 0}\frac{\mathrm{tr}\left(Y_{t+\tau} - X_\tau(t)Y_tX_\tau^T(t)\right)}{\tau} = \\ &= \lim_{\tau\to 0}\frac{\mathrm{tr}\left[X_{t+\tau}\left(X_{t+\tau}^{-1}Y_{t+\tau}X_{t+\tau}^{-T} - X_t^{-1}Y_tX_t^{-T}\right)X_{t+\tau}^T\right]}{\tau} = \\ &= \mathrm{tr}\left(\frac{d}{dt}\left(X_t^{-1}Y_tX_t^{-T}\right)X_t^TX_t\right) = \\ &= \mathrm{tr}\left(\frac{d}{dt}\left(X_t^{-1}Y_tX_t^{-T}X_t^TX_t\right)\right) - \mathrm{tr}\left(X_t^{-1}Y_tX_t^{-T}\frac{d}{dt}\left(X_t^TX_t\right)\right) = \\ &= \frac{d}{dt}\mathrm{tr}\,Y_t - \mathrm{tr}\left(X_t^{-1}Y_tX_t^{-T}\frac{dX_t^T}{dt}X_t\right) - \mathrm{tr}\left(X_t^{-1}Y_tX_t^{-T}X_t^T\frac{dX_t}{dt}\right) = \\ &= \frac{d}{dt}\mathrm{tr}\,Y_t - \mathrm{tr}\left(Y_tX_t^{-T}\frac{dX_t^T}{dt}\right)^T - \mathrm{tr}\left(X_t^{-1}Y_t\frac{dX_t}{dt}\right) = \\ &= \frac{d}{dt}\mathrm{tr}\,Y_t - 2\mathrm{tr}\left(\frac{dX_t}{dt}X_t^{-1}Y_t\right) = \frac{d}{dt}\mathrm{tr}\,Y_t - 2\,\mathrm{tr}\left(\frac{d\ln|X_t|}{dt}Y_t\right)\,. \end{aligned}$$

Since $Y_\tau(t)$ can be brought into its diagonal form by a symplectic transformation, Ω is invariant under this transformation and it doesn't change the sign of the inequality, we can rewrite the CP condition as

$$\mu_t \, \mathbb{1} + i \, \epsilon_t \, \Omega + o(\tau) \geq 0. \tag{A5}$$

The CP (infinitesimal) divisibility condition can then be easily expressed in terms of μ_t and ϵ_t:

$$\mu_t \geq |\epsilon_t| \qquad \forall \; t \geq 0 \; . \tag{A6}$$

It is obvious that if $\mu_t < 0$, i.e. if $\mathbf{Y}(t)$ is negative definite, the above condition is never satisfied. In the case $\delta_t < 0$, with $\mu_t = \sqrt{|\delta_t|}$, through a symplectic transformation we can bring (A1) into the form

$$\pm \, \mu_t \, \sigma_z + i \, \epsilon_t \, \Omega + o(\tau) \geq 0, \tag{A7}$$

which is never satisfied. □

Appendix A3: Proof of Theorem 3

Proof. Exploiting again the property that any 2x2 matrix divided by the square root of its determinant is a symplectic matrix, the P-divisibility condition (6) can be rewritten as

$$\forall \;\; S \in \mathrm{Sp}(2, \mathbb{R}) \; , \quad \frac{\det X_\tau(t)}{2} S S^T + Y_\tau(t) - \frac{i}{2}\Omega \geq 0 \; . \tag{A1}$$

We first consider the case $\delta_t \geq 0$, the above inequality can be recast as

$$\forall \;\; S \in \mathrm{Sp}(2, \mathbb{R}) \; , \quad \frac{\det X_\tau(t)}{2} S S^T + \mu_t \tau \mathbb{1} - \frac{i}{2}\Omega \geq 0 \; . \tag{A2}$$

Using the Euler decomposition of symplectic transformations $S = O_1 Z_z O_2$, where $Z_z \equiv \mathrm{diag}\{z, 1/z\}$ with $z \in (0, 1]$ and O_i is an orthogonal matrix we can further simplify the P condition as follows

$$\forall \; z \in (0, 1] \; , \quad \frac{\det X_\tau(t)}{2} Z_z + \mu_t \tau \mathbb{1} - \frac{i}{2}\Omega \geq 0 \; . \tag{A3}$$

At first order in τ, the eigenvalues of the lhs of (A3) are

$$\lambda_1 \;\; = \;\; \left(\frac{2 \, \epsilon_t \, z^2}{z^4 + 1} + \mu_t \right) \tau \; , \tag{A4}$$

$$\lambda_2 \;\; = \;\; \frac{z^4 + 1}{2 z^2} + \left(\frac{\left(z^8 + 1 \right) \epsilon_t}{z^6 + z^2} + \mu_t \right) \tau \; . \tag{A5}$$

We notice that λ_2 is always positive for small τ, hence the positivity of the intermediate map depends only on λ_1; in particular we have that the intermediate map is positive if

$$\frac{2 \epsilon_t \, z^2}{z^4 + 1} + \mu_t \geq 0 \qquad \forall \;\; z \in (0, 1] \; , \tag{A6}$$

which is equivalent to

$$\mu_t \geq \frac{|\epsilon_t| - \epsilon_t}{2} \; . \tag{A7}$$

In the case of $\delta_t < 0$ the P condition becomes

$$\forall \; z \in (0, 1] \; , \quad \frac{\det X_\tau(t)}{2} Z_z \pm \mu \tau \sigma_z - \frac{i}{2}\Omega \geq 0 \; , \tag{A8}$$

which is never satisfied. □

Appendix A4: Proof of Eq. (21)

The condition $\Lambda_+ \geq 0$ can be rewritten as

$$1 + e^{2 \int_0^t \epsilon_s ds} \left(-1 + 2 \int_0^t e^{-2 \int_0^r \epsilon_s ds} \mu_r dr \right) \geq 0$$

$$e^{-2 \int_0^t \epsilon_s ds} - 1 + 2 \int_0^t e^{-2 \int_0^r \epsilon_s ds} \mu_r dr \geq 0$$

$$-e^{- \int_0^t \epsilon_s ds} \sinh \left(\int_0^t \epsilon_s ds \right) + \int_0^t e^{-2 \int_0^r \epsilon_s ds} \mu_r dr \geq 0$$

Noticing that

$$e^{-\int_0^t \epsilon_s ds} \sinh\left(\int_0^t \epsilon_s ds\right) = \int_0^t \frac{d}{dt}\left[e^{-\int_0^t \epsilon_s ds} \sinh\left(\int_0^t \epsilon_s ds\right)\right] dt = \\ = \int_0^t e^{-2\int_0^r \epsilon_r dr} \epsilon_r dr$$

we finally get

$$\int_0^t e^{-2\int_0^r \epsilon_r dr} (\mu_r - \epsilon_r)\, dr \geq 0 \quad \forall\, t > 0\,. \tag{A1}$$

Analogously it can be shown that the condition $\Lambda_- \geq 0$ is equivalent to

$$\int_0^t e^{-2\int_0^r \epsilon_r dr} (\mu_r + \epsilon_r)\, dr \geq 0 \quad \forall\, t > 0\,. \tag{A2}$$